The Explanation of the Invalidity of the Statement: *"He committed Shirk but didn't become a Mushrik",* in Terms of the Arabic Language

فإن من فعل الشرك الأكبر سمي به لوجود حقيقة الشرك فيه, ولا يمكن أن يسمى مسلما لأنه ليس بمسلم في شيء إذ حقيقة الإسلام لم تتحقق فيه أصلا. وهؤلاء يتصورون مسلما مشركا, لكن بعضهم من جهلهم بأبسط الأمور في اللغة إذا قيل لهم ذلك ينكرونه ويقولون (**نحن نقرّ بأن هذا المسلم فعل الشرك الأكبر, لكنه ليس مشركا**).

ف(**مشركٌ**) في لغة العرب هو اسم الفاعل مِن (**أشرَكَ**), واسم الفاعل فيه معنى الفعل, ولذلك جاز أن يُوضع موضعَ الفعل وأن يَعمل عملَه في الجملة. فيجوز أن يقال (**زيدٌ أشرَكَ بالله شيئاً**), كما أنه يجوز أن يقال (**زيدٌ مشركٌ باللهِ شيئاً**), لا فرق بينهما في أصل المعنى, كما عند قولك (**زيد يشرب خمرا**) و(**زيد شارب خمرا**). ف(**شيئاً**) و(**خمراً**) في الجملتين مفعول إما للفعل أو لاسم الفاعل الذي يعمل في المفعول عملَه اللغويَّ. فكيف يأتي الآن شخص ويقول (**زيد يشرب خمرا...**) – فيقر بتحقُّق شربه للخمر –, (...**إلا أنه ليس شاربا للخمر, لأنه جاهل والجاهل معذور**)؟ أما الصواب

في مثل هذا فهو أن يقال (**زيد شرب خمرا, إلا أنه جهِل حرمة شُربِ الخمر جهلا معتبرا, فلا يعاقَب لجهله.**) أي تحققت فيه حقيقة الشرب فهو شارب بلا شك, لكن حكم الشرب يتخلف بسبب الجهل.

Verily, the one who has committed *Shirk al-Akbar* is called with it (i.e. *Shirk*) due to the presence of the essence of *Shirk* within him. It's not possible to call him Muslim because he cannot be a Muslim when the reality of Islam has by no means been established in him. And these people (who claim the opposite) envisage a muslim who is at the same time a *Mushrik.* But some of them when this is said to them -out of their ignorance of the simplest matter in the language- deny and say: *"We acknowledge that the muslim has committed Shirk al-Akbar, but he's not a Mushrik."*

The word "*Mushrik*" in Arabic is the active participle (اسم الفاعل) from the verb "*Ashraka* / أشرك". And the active participle has the meaning of the verb. Because of this, it is permissible (for the active participle) to be placed to the position of the verb and to do the function of it (the verb) in the sentence. So, it is permissible to be said *"Zayd associated something with Allah"* (زيدٌ أَشْرَكَ باللهِ شيئاً) likewise that is also permissible to be said *"Zayd is the one who associates something with Allah (i.e. Zayd is a Mushrik in Allah)"* (زيدٌ مشركٌ باللهِ شيئاً). And there is no difference between two with regard to the origin of the meaning. Just as your saying *"Zayd drinks alcohol"* (زيد يشرب خمرا) and *"Zayd is the one who drinks alcohol (i.e. Zayd is a drinker of an alcohol)"* (زيد شارب خمرا). And "something" and "alcohol" in these two sentences are objects either for the verb or for the active participle. So now, how can a person come and and say *"Zayd drinks alcohol"* -though he acknowledges his drinking alcohol is being actualized- *"But he is not the one who drinks alcohol because he is an ignorant and the ignorant is excused"*? However in such a case the accurate thing to be said: *"Zayd drank alcohol though he was ignorant about the prohibition of drinking alcohol with the considerable ignorance."* In other words, he has actualized the essence of drinking and he is without doubt a drinker. But (applying) the judgment of drinking falls behind because of the ignorance (of him).

[Abu Hamzah al-Afghani, Kitabu-l-Islam wa Adillatihi, 44-45]